



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of the world. It is too evident to need explanation. One of the most marked characteristics of our epoch is the development of mutual interest and sympathy among the peoples of the more advanced nations. It will not be many years until these peoples — farmers, artisans, shopkeepers, men of commerce and trade, etc. — will no longer permit their interests and welfare to be ruthlessly interfered with and jeopardized by the ambitions and pretensions of their sovereigns or even of their qualified representatives. They will insist upon knowing and determining what is said in their name and on their behalf to the governments and peoples of other countries, and the policies which shall be followed towards these peoples.

Another lesson of this unfortunate occurrence is that it has revealed again the extreme difficulty of the task of uprooting and getting rid of the international prejudices and animosities entailed by the wars and national ambitions and rivalries of former times. What Emperor William said in criticism of the British dislike of Germany and about the Boer War and the reported attempt at a continental combination to intervene and stop it, has opened several old sores in Europe which were thought to be healing. It has exposed the hot embers of ancient grudges and dislikes still smouldering and ready to burst into flames without much fanning. These old dislikes and grudges it will take many a year yet to destroy, even under the best conditions. Rulers and statesmen, who are supposed to understand the lessons of history, ought to be the last to tear open the old wounds. It will be next to a miracle if the growing *entente cordiale* between Great Britain and Germany, brought about by recent mutual visits of sovereigns, clergymen, burgomasters, business men, etc., is not seriously impaired by the publication of this interview. The friends of goodwill and harmony between the two peoples will have to redouble their efforts to put out the new fires that have been kindled.

The Emperor doubtless meant to promote more cordial friendship between the two countries, but he went about it in the wrong way. Nations do not like to be lectured and scolded any more than individuals. A good deal of what the Kaiser said about the sentiments prevailing among the two peoples toward each other is unquestionably true, though representatives of some of the classes in Germany of whose dislike for the English he spoke, have been quick to repel the charge and to declare that the masses of the German people are not ill-affected toward the English. But the Emperor was not the person to lecture the British people on their sins, and the manner in which he did this was especially unfortunate. If he had read a lecture to the Anglophobe classes of his own country it would have seemed more appropriate, though even this would certainly have subjected him to severe censure as unpatriotic and much too "English." One can imagine an interview of the Kaiser

in which he should have spoken with deep appreciation of the new attitude of so many of the English towards his country and of the better feelings of certain classes of the Germans towards England. This would have accomplished much more toward subduing the Englishmen who are as "mad as March hares" and making them kindly disposed toward him and his people than denouncing them before the world under reproachful similes. Infinite mischief has been done in the international world by indulgence in harsh criticism and in the bemeaning and belittling of foreign peoples. This cannot cease any too soon. So long as it continues, true international friendship and concord will have but a stunted growth.

It has been encouraging to note, in connection with the general excitement produced in Europe by this interview, as in the case of a number of other recent occurrences, that self-restraint and patience on the part of governments and peoples alike have made very distinct progress in recent years. Fifty years ago such a performance as that of which we are speaking would inevitably have led to war, as would the recent Casablanca affair between France and Germany. But nations no longer fly into childish passion and clamor for immediate war as they once did. Statesmen give themselves time for second thought, and endeavor to interpret what goes on across the borders in the same fair and just and even patient and forbearing spirit that they would wish shown toward themselves if their positions were reversed. Quickness to take insult and feel honor insulted is no longer considered the only or even the proper manner in which a nation may show itself great and self-respecting and heroic. Much more of the new virtue is of course greatly needed; but there is enough in sight already to indicate clearly in what direction the world, the family of nations, the community of peoples, is moving, in spite of sensational newspapers, jingo blusterings and over-talkative rulers. For this let us be sincerely grateful.

---

### Women and Peace.

The *Manchester Guardian* describes a great demonstration held in Manchester, England, recently in the interest of the suffrage for women. A procession of two thousand women ended in a mass meeting in one of the public parks. Various speakers, both men and women, including Mr. George H. Perris, organizing secretary of the London Peace Congress, and his assistant, Professor Charles Weiss, took up different topics assigned them, ranging from housing and health, poor law matters and labor legislation, to education and peace. There were ten platforms in all in the park, each platform marked with the subject of the meeting and surrounded by a group of eager or curious listeners.

At the Peace platform the chair was taken by Mrs.

Swanwick, who made a forcible statement of the relation of women to the peace cause.

"The object of the different placards which marked each platform, Mrs. Swanwick said, was to show why women wanted the vote and what they thought the possession of the vote would do for them. Each platform represented some great question in which women were interested, and in regard to which they had their own particular feminine point of view, but in the dealing with which they were to a large extent unrepresented. There was the peace question, and they had the spectacle of half the nation, to whom peace was a matter of vital concern, unrepresented and unable, therefore, to express their opinion upon it. Women would to a large extent represent peace in the council of the nation. From the platform of the Peace Society men had for many years tried to educate public opinion on this matter. Why did not they ask the women to help them? [Hear, hear.] How could they hope to get peace and establish on earth the kingdom of God without the help of those who, they all admitted, understood at least as much about the kingdom of God as men did? 'We women,' Mrs. Swanwick said, 'wish to help to establish the kingdom of God on earth, and we call upon the men to give us a chance, and to take us into their counsels. There are districts in many of our great cities so terribly bad that the police can only go there in couples or in fours. Yet women go into these streets alone, and no one touches them. Why is that? Because women go with love in their hearts.' [Applause.] In the case of war, Mrs. Swanwick continued, women had everything to lose and nothing to gain. They had been lately told that the world was ruled by force. There never was a more untrue or more iniquitous saying than that. [Hear, hear.] If by force was meant muscular force only, that was not true, but there were many other forces much stronger than that. History showed us, and our own hearts told us, that muscular force was only one of the forces of the world and the most uncivilized. The world, indeed, was ruled by moral force. They were told that force ruled the world, and that because woman could not fight she should not vote. There were many objections to that proposition, and she would first point to its logical absurdity. Fighters did not vote. In England soldiers and sailors did not vote. But women, if they could not fight, were called upon, as men were, to pay the piper. They paid for the army and navy precisely as men did. There was only one ground at the back of the force argument, which was that those who represented the nation should be those who had some stake in the country—those who had interests to be represented and those who did some service to the country. It was true men defended the race, but did not women bear the race? [Applause.] Did they not perform their great duty? If they did not bear arms, they bore the soldiers who bore the arms, and did an equal duty to the state with men."

It is not within the province of our journal to take up the advocacy of the cause of woman's suffrage. It must be confessed, however, that Mrs. Swanwick brought in favor of the suffrage for women, from the point of view of the peace of the world, one of the strongest arguments that can be made in its favor. It has been claimed by

some that if women were given the ballot an end of war would be made almost without delay. This seems to us to be at least a debatable question, for though women as a sex are more humane and tender than men, yet they in their way have probably been almost as responsible for war in the past as men. That is not true, however, at the present time. The intelligent, thinking women of our day—and the number of such women is increasing very rapidly—are almost without exception in favor of peace.

It is hardly true, as Mrs. Swanwick claims, that women are shut out from influence in promoting the cause of peace because they are denied the suffrage. In our country, at any rate, women have always worked by the side of men in the advocacy of the cause. This is true to a considerable extent also in England, where some of the leading peace workers are women. There are many lines of peace work in which women, even without the ballot, can accomplish much more than men. In the care and training of children in the home, in the education of young boys and girls in the schools and in the circles in which they mingle, both in social life and in the church, women have the power to exert an influence much greater in behalf of goodwill and peace than they have ever imagined.

We are very glad that so many women have seen this truth, and are not waiting for the ballot to commence to fulfill their duty in this direction. Perhaps a larger service in this direction on the part of a much greater number of women might be most effective in persuading the anti-suffragist men that women are entitled to vote and that they would use the suffrage wisely and well if granted.

### The Cosmopolitan Clubs Movement.

A very timely and promising movement is that of the International or Cosmopolitan Clubs in the larger colleges and universities. The purpose of these clubs is to bring together college young men from different countries, "to learn the customs, viewpoints and characteristics of other nationalities, to remove national prejudices and establish international friendships."

The first club of this kind was the International Club of the University of Wisconsin, organized March 12, 1903, by eighteen foreign students. This club now has a membership of eighty, and is the most flourishing club in the University. A Cosmopolitan Club was formed at Cornell University November 30, 1904, with a New Zealander as president, a German as secretary and a United States member as treasurer. In 1906 and 1907 similar clubs were organized in the University of Michigan, the University of Illinois, Purdue, Louisiana, Ohio State and Chicago. Some twenty other larger